







UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DA	TE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/756,831	01/08/2001		John Peter Karidis	RPS920000078US1	6862
7590 01/23/2004		/23/2004		EXAMINER	
John Bruce Schelkopf			SHIN, CHRISTOPHER B		
IBM Corporation Legal Dept.				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Dept. 9CCA/B		2182	< <tr> ✓</tr>		
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709				DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004	• •

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	0
09/756,831	KARIDIS, JOHN PETER	g
Examiner	Art Unit	
Christopher B Shin	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
 a)	he final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally s (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date o timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	fee. The appropriate extension set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>12 December 2003</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the app	•
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOT	E below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially red issues for appeal; and/or	lucing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejection.	ected claims.
NOTE:	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered by application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or app	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: 1-14.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Exam	iner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10.☑ Other: <u>See also the Interview Summary attachment</u>	CHRISTOPHER B. SHIN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP \$2182

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Advisory Action

Part of Paper No. 8

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the examiner's interpretations of the present claims and the teachings of prior art is different from the applicant, as also the examiner and the applicant have extensively dicussed, during the telephone conversation initiated by the applicant (12-3-2003), the disgreement which comes from the interpretations of claims and the known art teachings of the prior art.